REMARKS

Claim Objections

Misnumbered Claims 38-46 have been renumbered as Claims 39-47, respectively. The former erroneous dependencies of dependent Claims 40—42, 44 and 46 have also been amended herein. Any objections to Claims 1-38 are now moot since these claims have been cancelled. Reconsideration and removal of these objections are respectfully solicited.

Rejection of Claims 1-47 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Fletcher-Haynes et al. U.S. Published Application No. US 2001/0034614 A1 (hereinafter "Fletcher-Haynes").

Claims 1-38 have been cancelled. Independent Claims 39, 43, 45 and 47 have been amended to include a determination that a blood component collection kit is compatible with a selected blood component collection application as a part of the automation of the workflow in a blood processing center.

Fletcher-Haynes does not fairly teach or suggest the

invention claimed in amended independent Claims 39, 43, 45 or 47 for the following reasons.

Fletcher-Haynes is generally concerned with manipulating and optimizing blood collection procedures to maximize the type or amount of blood components that may be collected from a particular donor. As an example, Paragraph 0195 of Fletcher-Haynes is concerned with an inventory of blood components (also referred to as "units"), i.e., platelets, plasma and RBCs, that have previously been collected. Thus, one of the objects of the optimization procedures of Fletcher-Haynes is to collect blood components that are not already in plentiful supply at the blood centers or hospitals. The selection of the blood component to be collected under the Fletcher-Haynes procedure is therefore not necessarily in accordance with any nomogram, as in the present invention, but is, instead, subject to external considerations of current inventories.

The manipulation and optimization techniques taught by Fletcher-Haynes are also directed to maximizing the blood component yield in a fixed time. See, e.g., the Abstract of Fletcher-Haynes.

Unlike the present invention, Fletcher-Haynes does not fairly disclose or teach methods (Claims 39-44),

systems (Claims 45-46) or media (Claim 47) that, inter alia, determines whether a blood component collection kit is compatible with a selected blood component collection application. Similarly, while Fletcher-Haynes may record the identity of the operator of the blood collection instrument, there does not appear to be any determination whether the operator of the blood component collection instrument is qualified to run the selected blood component collection application or process, as recited in amended Claims 41 and 44.

The Applicants are not in agreement with the reasons cited in many of the rejections of the dependent claims. However, since independent Claims 39, 43 and 45 are believed to be patentable over the cited art, the dependent claims should also be allowable as placing additional limitations on independent Claims 39, 43 and 45.

Reconsideration and removal of the rejections of Claims 39-47 are respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that Claims 39-47 patentably distinguish over the prior art and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Early allowance is respectfully solicited.

It is believed that no fees are due. However, if any fees are applicable, kindly charge any such fees to our deposit account number 50-1039.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to further discuss any of these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

November 1, 2005
Dated

James S. Pristelski
Registration No. 27,222

COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street - #2850
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 236-8500